



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20281  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,071	01/03/2000	LEE ROY COPELAND	511-003	1167

7590 08/13/2002

THE HALVORSON LAW FIRM  
405 W SOUTHERN AVE  
SUITE 1  
TEMPE, AZ 85282

[REDACTED]  
EXAMINER:

LEVY, NEIL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1616	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
13	

DATE MAILED:

*Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application*

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

a)  is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run 3 months from the date of the final rejection  
b)  expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 2/17/02 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1.  The proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

- a.  There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- b.  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
- c.  They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
- d.  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- e.  They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2.  Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3.  Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment D will be entered  will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:  
Cancelling withdrawn claims; 14-21, 35-47 have not been cancelled,

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 1-13, 22-34

However;

Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): 112 rejections are withdrawn

4.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because Applicant's arguments are NOT persuasive or reference of record it may, Kalloniatis is not met, all did close the general composition claimed,

5.  The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.  
regardless of processing considerations claimed; Applicant has not  
 The proposed drawing correction  has  has not been approved by the examiner.  
 Other drawn or claimed any specific compounds advantages having  
superiority over standard or alternative processes

*NEIL S. LEVY*  
NEIL S. LEVY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER